REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the Office Action which suggests that restriction for examination purposes is proper, Applicant cancels withdrawn claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 20, and 21. Applicant reserves right to file a continuation application directed to subject matter of the canceled claims. Claims 22-31 are added. Accordingly, claims 22-31 are pending in the present application.

Claim 22 recites a method of processing a document. The method comprises scanning the document to capture digitized image data which is representative of an image of the document, calculating a first value based upon a first image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of a corner of the document image, calculating a second value based upon a second image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of the corner of the document image, comparing the first calculated value with a first predetermined threshold value to determine if the corner of the document image is missing, and comparing the second calculated value with a second predetermined threshold value to determine if a missing corner of the document image is the result of a fold after the corner is determined to be missing based upon the comparison of the first calculated value with the first predetermined threshold value.

None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests a method of processing a document, wherein the method comprises scanning the document to capture digitized image data which is representative of an image of the document, calculating a first value based upon a first image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of a corner of the document image, calculating a second value based upon a second image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of the corner of the document image, comparing the first calculated value with a first predetermined threshold value to determine if the corner of the document image is missing, and comparing the second calculated value with a second predetermined threshold value to determine if a missing corner of the document image is the result of a fold after the corner is determined to be missing based upon the

comparison of the first calculated value with the first predetermined threshold value. Thus, claim 22 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

If the Examiner rejects claim 22 by continuing to apply Kagami, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically point out where Kagami even discloses digitized image data which is representative of an image of a document, let alone other elements recited in claim 22.

Claim 23 depends from claim 22 and is allowable for the reasons claim 22 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 23 further recites selecting a third predetermined threshold value which is different from the first predetermined threshold value when a missing corner of the document image is unable to be determined to be the result of a fold, comparing the first calculated value with the third predetermined threshold value to determine if a corner of the document image is missing, and comparing the second calculated value with the second predetermined threshold value to determine if a missing corner of the document image is the result of a fold after the corner is determined to be missing based upon the comparison of the first calculated value with the third predetermined threshold value. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 23 in combination with the structure recited in claim 22. Thus, claim 23 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly on in combination, and is therefore allowable.

If the Examiner rejects claim 23 by continuing to apply Kagami, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically point out where Kagami discloses, inter alia, a first predetermined threshold value, a second predetermined threshold value, and a third predetermined threshold value.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is allowable for the reasons claim 23 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 24 further recites that the second predetermined threshold value is different from the first predetermined threshold value. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 24 in combination with the structure recited in claim 23. Thus,

7

claim 24 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly on in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 25 depends from claim 22 and is allowable for the reasons claim 22 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 25 further recites concluding that the document image is unusable when a missing corner of the document image is determined to be the result of a fold. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 25 in combination with the structure recited in claim 22. Thus, claim 25 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly on in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 26 recites a method of processing a document. The method comprises scanning a document to capture pixel data which is representative of an image of the document, calculating a first count of pixels associated with a corner of the document image, calculating a second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, determining if the corner of the document image is missing based upon the first count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, and if the corner in the document image is determined to be missing, determining if the missing corner is the result of a fold based upon the second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image.

None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests a method of processing a document, wherein the method comprises scanning a document to capture pixel data which is representative of an image of the document, calculating a first count of pixels associated with a corner of the document image, calculating a second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, determining if the corner of the document image is missing based upon the first count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, and if the corner in the document image is determined to be missing, determining if the missing corner is the result of a fold based upon the second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image. Thus, claim 26 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

If the Examiner rejects claim 26 by continuing to apply Kagami, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically point out where Kagami even discloses capturing pixel data which is representative of an image of the document, let alone other elements recited in claim 26.

Claim 27 recites an apparatus comprising means for scanning a document to capture digitized image data which is representative of an image of the document, means for calculating a first value based upon a first image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of a corner of the document image, means for calculating a second value based upon a second image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of the corner of the document image, means for comparing the first calculated value with a first predetermined threshold value to determine if the corner of the document image is missing, and means for comparing the second calculated value with a second predetermined threshold value to determine if a missing corner of the document image is the result of a fold after the corner is determined to be missing based upon the comparison of the first calculated value with the first predetermined threshold value.

None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests means for scanning a document to capture digitized image data which is representative of an image of the document, means for calculating a first value based upon a first image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of a corner of the document image, means for calculating a second value based upon a second image data portion which is representative of at least a portion of the corner of the document image, means for comparing the first calculated value with a first predetermined threshold value to determine if the corner of the document image is missing, and means for comparing the second calculated value with a second predetermined threshold value to determine if a missing corner of the document image is the result of a fold after the corner is determined to be missing based upon the comparison of the first calculated value with the first predetermined threshold value. Thus, claim 27 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

9

Claim 28 depends from claim 27 and is allowable for the reasons claim 27 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 28 further recites means for selecting a third predetermined threshold value which is different from the first predetermined threshold value when a missing corner of the document image is unable to be determined to be the result of a fold, means for comparing the first calculated value with the third predetermined threshold value to determine if a corner of the document image is missing, and means for comparing the second calculated value with the second predetermined threshold value to determine if a missing corner of the document image is the result of a fold after the corner is determined to be missing based upon the comparison of the first calculated value with the third predetermined threshold value. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 28 in combination with the structure recited in claim 27. Thus, claim 28 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly on in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and is allowable for the reasons claim 28 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 29 further recites that the second predetermined threshold value is different from the first predetermined threshold value. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 29 in combination with the structure recited in claim 28. Thus, claim 29 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly on in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 30 depends from claim 27 and is allowable for the reasons claim 27 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 30 further recites means for concluding that the document image is unusable when a missing corner of the document image is determined to be the result of a fold. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 30 in combination with the structure recited in claim 27. Thus, claim 30 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly on in combination, and is therefore allowable.

10

Claim 31 recites an apparatus comprising means for scanning a document to capture pixel data which is representative of an image of the document, means for calculating a first count of pixels associated with a corner of the document image, means for calculating a second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, means for determining if the corner of the document image is missing based upon the first count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, and means for, if the corner in the document image is determined to be missing, determining if the missing corner is the result of a fold based upon the second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image.

None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests means for scanning a document to capture pixel data which is representative of an image of the document, means for calculating a first count of pixels associated with a corner of the document image, means for calculating a second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, means for determining if the corner of the document image is missing based upon the first count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image, and means for, if the corner in the document image is determined to be missing, determining if the missing corner is the result of a fold based upon the second count of pixels associated with the corner of the document image. Thus, claim 31 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Chan
Reg. No. 33,663
Attorney for Applicant

NCR Corporation, Law Department, WHQ4
1700 S. Patterson Blvd., Dayton, OH 45479-0001
Tel. No. 937-445-4956/Fax No. 937-445-3733

AUG 20 2004

11